

## Legislative Staffer Education Effort UPDATE December 2008

PSRSPC  
Executive Meeting  
12/2/08

On November 11, 2008 legislative analyst representatives from PSRSPC member agencies met to review and discuss the initial approach for Legislative staff education effort as endorsed by the PSRSPC Executive at the August 12 and September 30 meetings.

This original approach included the following timeline:

- **October:** Convene a meeting of legislative analysts from each PSRSPC member agency. Craft message and identify teams of two who will go on visits.
- **November:** Meet with Public Safety and Fiscal committee staff.
- **December:** Meet with target member staffers, keeping in mind that new members start December 4.
- **2009:** Visits with individual Legislators and/or an event (to be determined given what is learned in 2008).
- **Goal for effort – 2008:** The goal of this effort is to educate the legislative committee staffers and member staffers on current interoperability efforts.

### Key November 11 Meeting Outcomes:

1. There was consensus among Analysts that visits (to committee staffers or member staffers) should wait until after the 2009 Report to the Legislature is final.
2. A dual approach to the effort is needed:
  - a. INTERNAL. Outreach, education, seeking support from within the Administration.
  - b. EXTERNAL. Outreach education to committee staffers and member staffers (and subsequently the Legislators).

### Points Related to Internal efforts needed:

- ✚ Seek more direction and feedback from PSRSPC Executive Committee on need to engage with the Administration.
  - Some felt there needs to be specific permission from the administration before engaging in this effort.
  - Others thought that unless the Legislators are being asked for something specific (education only) it is ok.
- ✚ Chief Deputies need to decide this is a priority.
- ✚ Policy people at Secretary level need to be briefed on this effort.
- ✚ It is critical the group has clarity and unity on the BCP process as this will be necessary to meet funding goals.
- ✚ Need a legislative champion.
- ✚ Will need to 'come to the table' with a clear definition of the problem, some solutions and options to fund.

### Points Related to External efforts needed:

- ✚ Legislators need to know that they will have to do upgrades and achieve a narrow-band platform by 2012, or Agencies will not be able to transmit. Many agencies do not have the funding for this.
- ✚ The 10 year strategic plan will be a useful tool in 'selling' needs. This should be kept in mind as it is developed.
- ✚ Success with 'internal' efforts will bolster success with 'external' efforts.

**Public Safety Radio Strategic Planning Committee (PSRSPC)**  
**Decision Matrix Process for the Evaluation of Grant Applications**

(draft for consideration 12/02/08)

PSRSPC  
Executive  
Meeting  
  
12/02/08

As the statutorily designated organization that oversees interoperability efforts for state agencies in California, the PSRSPC is tasked with periodically deciding how grant funds designated for state-level interoperable communications projects are distributed. The PSRSPC has decided to explore the use of a decision matrix to assist in the evaluation and ranking of future grant applications. This approach was discussed at several meetings throughout 2008 and a draft tool was agreed upon.

A decision matrix is used to evaluate possible solutions (grant applications) against a predetermined set of criteria that the group selects. A decision matrix allows a group to consider all solutions against the same set of criteria and to record evaluations in one place.

The decision matrix does not necessarily represent the group's final decision, but it helps the group reach a point at which it can make a high quality, informed decision. The process of working through a decision matrix forces the discipline of gathering more information and asking more questions about each grant application, if necessary. The process causes people to see options from several perspectives and removes preconceived notions about what the solution should be.

PSRSPC decided on a list of criteria against which to evaluate each grant application. The criteria were divided in to two categories: (1) must have and (2) desirable. The desirable criteria were each assigned a numerical weight, a number that indicates how important it is to the final decision.

The PSRSPC Technical Working Group (TWG) will screen each grant application against the must have criterion.

If an application does not meet *all* the must have criteria, as agreed upon by the full group, there is an option for the applicant to revise and resubmit the proposal within a short turnaround time.

Once the TWG agrees that an application passes all the criteria within the must have category, the application will be sent to the PSRSPC for a secondary screening evaluation.

The PSRSPC will then screen the application against the desirable category of criteria it has established.

Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 signifying that the proposal meets the criterion very well and 1 signifying that the proposal meets the criterion only to a minimum extent, each PSRSPC member will individually score the proposal on each of the desirable criterion.

Scores for each of the desirable criterion will be collated and multiplied by the pre determined numerical weight which has been assigned in advance to each criterion. The proposal will then be given a numerical score for each of the desirable criteria, and in turn a total score, which represents the combined ratings of the full group.

The next step is to look at the highest scoring alternative and determine whether this really does seem to be the best decision. The group may want to ask if any criteria were overlooked and whether this seems like the right decision, why or why not? Is there group enthusiasm for the results?

If it is decided that additional criteria is needed, each application can be rescored against the new criteria.

The decision matrix methodology is designed to help the PSRSPC come to consensus through an orderly process of ranking, prioritizing, eliminating, and/or evaluating. It fosters thorough evaluation of ideas and can help resolve conflict as part of the consensus process.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

11/26/2008 9:08 AM

(This document contains excerpts from, "The Facilitator Excellence Handbook" by Fran Rees.)